

Application No. 10/518,444
Amendment dated August 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 10, 2006

Docket No.: 2611-0228PUS1

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings (Figs. 13-15) include changes to add the legend "Prior Art".

Attachment: Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, and 12 are independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection in view of the Amendments and the following Remarks.

Specification

The specification has been amended to correct the spelling of "Cayley". Thus, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification in view of the Amendment.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 12 have been amended to replace the misspelled word "Caylay" with – Cayley --. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objections to claims 7 and 12. Applicant respectfully submits these amendments are editorial in nature and that these amendments are not narrowing, and are not made for a reason relating to patentability. Accordingly, it is submitted that these amendments do not give rise to estoppel and, in future analysis, claims 7 and 12 are entitled to their full range of equivalents.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because Figs. 13-15 should be designated by a legend indicating only that which is old is illustrated. Drawing corrections are filed concurrently herewith in which the legend "PRIOR ART" has been added to Figs. 13-15. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 of co-pending Application No. 10/482,815. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 of the co-pending Application No. 10/482,815 have been canceled. Claims 11-25 are currently pending on the '815 application. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims of the instant application are patentably distinct from claims 11-25 of the '815 application and do not anticipate those claims.

Furthermore, a brief telephone conversation with the Examiner on May 16, 2006 confirmed that the alleged double-patenting rejection is deficient due to the Examiner's application of the cancelled claims of the '815 application in construing the rejection. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the double-patenting rejection upon filing a response to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this matter, she is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam (Reg. No. 58,755), who may be reached in the Washington, DC, area at (703) 205-8000.

Application No. 10/518,444
Amendment dated August 8, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 10, 2006

Docket No.: 2611-0228PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant